

**Public Health Statute Modernization
Turning Point National Excellence Collaborative
TELECONFERENCE NOTES**

June 22, 2000

Participants:

Stephen Braunginn, Urban League of Greater Madison, Wisconsin
Kathryn Broderick, Oregon Health Division, Oregon
Deborah Erickson, Division of Public Health, Alaska
Denise Hase, Northeast County Health Department, Colorado
Peggy Hintzman, Wisconsin Public Health Association, Wisconsin
Janet Lewelyn, Shawano County Health Department, Wisconsin
Bud Nicola, Centers for Disease Control & RWJ TP National Program Office
Dave Palm, Department of Health & Human Services, Nebraska
Alice Rarig, Division of Public Health, Alaska
Jack Thompson, UW School of PH & RWJ TP National Program Office
Elizabeth Zelazek, Wisconsin Public Health Association, Wisconsin

Summary of Decisions/Action Items:

- ?? May 30 teleconference notes were approved with one correction: Denise pointed out that Cynthia Honssinger's name was misspelled and that her title was incorrect (should be Director of Legal and Regulatory Affairs for the Colorado Department of Health).
- ?? Deb will contact the NPO to see if there's anything we can do to help expedite Wisconsin's grant award.
- ?? Deb will contact the NPO to see if we can get a supply of Larry Gostin's monograph on public health law for distribution to our Collaborative members.
- ?? Jack will send Deb a copy of the NACCHO 2-page research brief on the different types of state public health systems for distribution to the Collaborative.
- ?? Deb will award Larry Gostin's first phase contract with caveat that scope of work will continue to be negotiated and defined in greater detail.
- ?? Stephen will send the list of Wisconsin's additional questions/comments regarding Larry Gostin's contract proposal to Deb.
- ?? Deb will ask Larry Gostin for a one-page description of his Collaborating Center for Public Health Law and will distribute it to our Collaborative. Collaborative members will review the description as soon as they receive it and let Deb know if they have any concerns about her writing a letter on behalf of our Collaborative indicating our intent to participate as a partner organization in Larry's Collaborative. If there are no objections, Deb will write the letter and send it to Larry for inclusion in his CDC grant application.
- ?? The primary focus of the August meeting in Denver will be to discuss the first phase (assessment) scope of work. We'll hold off on inviting new partners and having the discussion on principles and framework until the October meeting in Arizona.
- ?? Deb will solicit bids from Denver hotels, and let everyone know as soon as a contract has been awarded for the August meeting site.
- ?? Send letters out to new collaborative members this summer inviting them to participate in the collaborative and in the October meeting in Arizona.

Review and Discussion of May 30 Teleconference Minutes

Regarding Jack's assignment to check with the National Program Office on the feasibility of their providing the requested \$165,000 contribution to the joint collaborative budget -Jack mentioned that he hadn't had an opportunity to talk to Bobbie yet as she's been in Africa, but he believes it's a reasonable request and doesn't anticipate any problems.

Denise pointed out that Cynthia Honssinger's name was misspelled in the minutes, and that she was incorrectly identified as the State Health Director for Colorado. She's actually the State Health Department's attorney; title – Director of Legal and Regulatory Affairs.

The minutes from the May 30 teleconference were approved with the noted corrections to Cynthia Honssinger's spelling and title.

Status of New State Partners

Elizabeth mentioned that Wisconsin's grant for participating in the Statute Modernization Collaborative is still pending. Wisconsin asked for the Collaborative's help in expediting their grant so they have funding in time to attend the Denver meeting in August.

Denise reported that the Colorado Association of Local Public Health Leaders submitted an application to the Turning Point National Program Office for a grant to participate in the Statute Modernization Collaborative. Their grant probably will not be awarded until sometime this Fall.

Review and Discussion: Larry Gostin's Contract Proposal

The following comments and questions regarding Larry's proposal were compiled from Collaborative members earlier in June and shared with Larry. Deb reviewed these and shared Larry's responses with the group:

Comments on Larry's Proposal

- ?? The statement of purpose and work products are very good.
- ?? "framing the Act through a discussion of fundamental principles of public health" should be initiated early in Phase I, instead of waiting until the beginning of Phase II. This activity is key to the foundation of the whole project - I see this as part of laying the foundation (Phase I). *Deb shared that Larry had thought this was a very good idea.*
- ?? We need to bring our additional Collaborative partners on soon - not wait until Phase II as the proposal implies. *Larry agreed.*
- ?? The time frame between the end of the assessment (April 30, 2001) and the development of the final Model Law Act (August, 2003) seems lengthy. I realize that it is critical to obtain buy-in and reach a consensus and we do not want to short change the process. The long time frame also significantly reduces the time for the Phase III activities. I think that it will be very difficult to accomplish these in 7 months. Would it be possible to develop at least a very good draft of the Model Law by November-December of 2002 so that a few states could test it during the 2003 legislative session? If we encounter problems with consensus building, we

could always revert back to the original schedule. Finally, I realize that we need to work with Larry on a time frame that is comfortable for him. Advancing these dates may not be within his comfort level. *Larry agreed that this timeframe could be adjusted back to reflect our workplan. The collaborative discussed this issue further, identifying the need to identify test states earlier in the process (by June 2000) and figure out the steps we need to take to mesh with the test states' political processes, pointing out that the best feedback to the work we'll be doing on the model is to put it in motion.*

- ?? Terminology referencing the groups in Phase II is inconsistent. "Expert Panel" and "Expert Committee" should be "Expanded Collaborative." *Not a problem to fix this.*
- ?? Would like to see more involvement of the Collaborative and other key figures in the public health community in Phase III - around dissemination of the product. *Not a problem – we can all work to make the process as broad and externally focused as possible.*
- ?? Under project staff roles, one of Larry's roles is described as Chair of the meetings concerning the Model Act. The Collaborative membership needs to select their Chair. Probably shouldn't be the consultant, but that role may be delegated to him periodically. *Not a problem.*

Questions re: Larry's Proposal

- ?? During Phase I, will the research team assess the public health laws in all states or only selected states? *Larry had explained to Deb that, beyond the "assessment of assessments", additional research will be conducted in certain selected states. Jack suggested that we refer to the NACCHO 2-page research brief to identify the different types of state public health systems and identify the states for research so that the full range of different types is covered. Jack indicated that he would send a copy of the brief to Deb for distribution to the Collaborative.*
- ?? Not clear what the Project Research Memo is. Will this memo describe the research process? *Yes – this memo will be a report on the research work plan.*
- ?? Under the "Specific Objectives" section for Phase II is the statement "Additional professional drafting assistance may be required." What does this mean exactly? Do we need to budget for additional time or an additional consultant to provide legislative drafting? *Potentially. Larry had indicated that in the similar project he had conducted for CDC to develop the model privacy act, he had been able to provide for the legislative drafting under that contract. We can't know for sure at this point if there will be enough resources in our contract until we start the work and have a better feel for how much time and effort it's really going to take.*
- ?? Our work team has discussed the possibility of developing a state self-assessment tool. Is this a product that should/could be added? *Yes - Larry had explained that he thought it would be relatively simple to create a state self-assessment tool by developing a checklist as we're developing the model law. He had also mentioned that he could help with one of the other additional projects – development of an impact assessment tool – as he had done this before. Jack mentioned that there is a section on this in Larry's monograph. The group asked Deb if she could get a supply of the monograph from the National Program Office, assuming the reprint is complete.*

Additional Comments/Questions Raised During the Teleconference

?? The budget doesn't describe the hourly rate for the principle and staff – we need to know how much time we're buying.

?? It seems as though we're asking Larry to do some of what he has already done before (in terms of Phase I – Assessment). What new work will he be doing? What questions do we want answered by the assessment? Emphasis needs to be on new products. Financing would be new work. Scope of work needs to be clarified – may do through contract amendments.

The Wisconsin representatives indicated that they had additional comments/questions, but we ran out of time to discuss them on the teleconference. Stephen will get Wisconsin's list of questions to Deb for distribution to the group for discussion at the August meeting.

The group initially discussed holding off on establishing the first-phase contract with Larry until we negotiated a more detailed scope of work, but the group decided (with assurance from Deb that the contract provisions would give us the necessary flexibility for making future changes through amendments) that we need to establish the contract with Larry prior to the August meeting. We decided to devote the August meeting to discussing and detailing the scope of work for Larry's assessment contract.

Discussion: Request for Letter of Support from Larry Gostin for CDC PH Law Collaborative Center

Deb explained that she had received a positive response from everyone in the collaborative who had responded to her e-mail regarding Larry Gostin's invitation to our Collaborative to participate as a partner organization in his proposed Collaborating Center for Public Health Law for which he was applying for CDC funding. Respondents had indicated that we should provide a letter of support for Larry's application, but a couple of people had indicated an interest in having additional information on the proposal, and about knowing more about how Larry sees our role as a partner in the new Center. Deb had also discussed these questions with Larry. He had explained that he saw our two Collaboratives as coordinating closely to identify potential joint projects and to avoid duplication, and that each Collaborative would have a liaison to the other to facilitate coordination.

Overall, the group felt comfortable providing a letter of support for Larry's proposal, but wanted more information from Larry prior to providing a letter indicating our intent to participate as a partner. Deb said she would request a one-page description from Larry and would distribute it to the group for review and approval prior to sending a letter on behalf of our Collaborative. She warned that the turn-around time would be short because Larry was currently on vacation and wouldn't return for about 10 days, and his application will be due within a week of his return.

August Meeting Plans

Based on the discussion regarding Gostin's contract and the need to spend time working out the details of what the assessment project will cover and the contract scope of work, the group decided to make this issue the focus of the August meeting. Everyone agreed to defer the discussion on principles and framework for the model Act until the October meeting in Arizona,

and also agreed to hold off on inviting the new Collaborative members until the October meeting. The group advised that we send a letter out to the new members sometime this summer inviting them to participate in the collaborative, and inviting them to the October meeting.

Location: The group asked that the meeting be held closer to the airport, as opposed to someplace in downtown Denver which potentially could be 30-45 minutes from the airport. This will allow folks arriving on Tuesday morning or leaving right after the meeting on Wednesday to get to the airport in a timely manner. Deb will solicit bids from hotels on the airport-side of town, and will let the group know the location and reservation information as soon as a contract is awarded.

Collaborative Web Site

Deb mentioned that she has set up a temporary web site for our collaborative under Alaska's Turning Point project's web site -<http://www.hss.state.ak.us/dph/APHIP/collaborative>. She explained that she was considering it temporary because the Turning Point National Program Office (NPO) plans to set up a web site for the five National Collaboratives, and thinks it will be more appropriate to have our Collaborative's web page on the NPO's site, rather than Alaska's. This temporary site is established to provide a brief description of the project and to provide web-based access to meeting minutes and other documents (workplan, charter, etc.) during the interim.

Next Steps:

Schedule Next Teleconference: The group decided we didn't need another teleconference prior to our August meeting in Denver.